

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated August 19, 2009, claims 1-15 of the present application were rejected. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the present application.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2005/0081159, hereafter “Gupta”) in view of McLaren et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,794, hereafter “McLaren”). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above rejection based on the remarks below.

Claim 1 recites, in part, that the reproduction control section controls the reproduction method so that a reproduction method for the cited data is different from a reproduction method for data other than the cited data in the received mail data. Applicants respectfully submit that this feature of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by any combination of Gupta and McLaren.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Gupta does not disclose the reproduction control section. Therefore, McLaren must disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1 in order for any combination of Gupta and McLaren to render claim 1 obvious.

Applicants respectfully submit that McLaren fails to disclose or suggest that the reproduction control section controls the reproduction method so that a reproduction method for the cited data is different from a reproduction method for data other than the cited data in the received mail data, based on the following remarks.

McLaren discloses allowing a user to control a playback speed of a video stream by selecting trick play streams in which the playback speed of the video stream is altered (McLaren, Col.5, Lines 45-50). In other words, McLaren discloses **user controlled** playback speed of a video stream. Therefore, the playback speed of the video stream is determined not by data type (e.g. cited data from mail data created by a creator different from a creator of the received mail) but by arbitrary user selection.

Contrast the above playback control method of McLaren to that of claim 1 in which the reproduction control section controls the reproduction method so that a reproduction method for the cited data is different from a reproduction method for data other than the cited data in the received mail data. In other words, claim 1 recites controlling the reproduction method of data based on **data type** (e.g. whether data is cited data or data other than cited data).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that McLaren fails to disclose or suggest the reproduction control section controls the reproduction method so that a reproduction method for the cited data is different from a reproduction method for data other than the cited data in the received mail data.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren.

Further, claims 2-7 are patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren based at least on their dependency from claim 1.

Regarding claim 8, Applicants note that claim 8 recites, in part, that reproducing the cited data detected from the received mail data and data other than the cited data in the received mail data in different methods. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren for reasons similar to those as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Further, claims 9-14 are patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren based at least on their dependency from claim 8.

Regarding claim 15, Applicants note that claim 15 recites, in part, that a reproduction control section controls a reproduction method of the received mail so that a reproduction method for the cited data is different from a reproduction method for data other than the cited data in the received mail data. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is

patentable over any combination of Gupta and McLaren for reasons similar to those as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8, and 15, as well as the claims depending therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tetsuyuki NAKAYASU

/Stephen W. Kopchik/

By 2009.11.12 15:31:07 -05'00'

Stephen W. Kopchik
Registration No. 61,215
Attorney for Applicant

SWK/DMO/rgf
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 12, 2009